

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/811,389

Applicant(s)

KOZO MANO

Examiner

Hai C Pham

Art Unit

2861

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C. Pham.

(3) _____

(2) Randolph A. Smith, Attorney.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 August 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 11, 13, 21 and 23-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Matsuyama (U.S. 6,292,279) & Takahashi et al. (U.S. 5,883,385).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative points out the critical features of the invention, whose inclusion in the base claims would overcome the prior art made of record, namely the photographic paper being directly exposed by the laser beams, the laser beams being adjusted to be coincided on the surface of the photographic paper, a conveyor for linearly conveying the photographic paper at a constant speed toward the scanning area, and the developer for developing the latent image on the photographic paper. The examiner indicates that further search would be needed once the claims are amended as indicated above.